	Case 1:23-cv-00054-HBK Document 2	13 Filed 12/21/22	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT,	No. 2:21-cv-171	0 AC P
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>	
14	J. CLARK KELSO, et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16		I	
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42		
18	U.S.C. § 1983.		
19	Upon screening the original complaint, the court advised plaintiff that "if, upon amending		
20	the complaint, all viable defendants appear to reside in Kings County, he will be required to		
21	show cause why this case should not be transferred to the Fresno Division of this court." ECF		
22	No. 9 at 7. Plaintiff has now filed an amended complaint that names only defendants that appear		
23	to reside in Kings County, which is also the location of the alleged constitutional violations. ECF		
24	No. 12.		
25	The federal venue statute provides that		
26	[a] civil action may be brought in		
27	(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located;		
28			
		1	

## Case 1:23-cv-00054-HBK Document 13 Filed 12/21/22 Page 2 of 2 1 (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of 2 property that is the subject of the action is situated; or 3 (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this action, any judicial district in which any defendant 4 is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action. 5 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). A district court may, on its own motion, "transfer a case sua sponte under 6 the doctrine of forum non conveniens, as codified at 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), so long as the parties 7 are first given the opportunity to present their views on the issue." Costlow v. Weeks, 790 F.2d 8 1486, 1488 (9th Cir. 1986) (citations omitted). In this case, such a transfer appears proper. 9 The conduct alleged to have violated plaintiff's rights occurred at California State Prison-10 Corcoran, which is located in Kings County, which is in the Fresno Division of this court. 11 Furthermore, all currently named defendants also appear to reside in Kings County. J. Clark 12 Kelso and S. Gates—who were named in the original complaint and appeared to be the only 13 defendants located within the Sacramento Division of this court—have not been included in the 14 amended complaint. It therefore appears that this action should proceed in the Fresno Division of 15 this court and plaintiff must show cause in writing why this case should not be transferred to the 16 Fresno Division. 17 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within twenty-one days of the service of 18 this order, plaintiff must show cause in writing why this case should not be transferred to the 19 Fresno Division of this court. If plaintiff does not object to this case being transferred, he may 20 file a notice consenting to the transfer. 21 DATED: December 20, 2022

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE